Indigenously produced anti-cancer drugs

667. DR. R. K. PODDAR:
SHRI NARAYAN KAR:

Will the PRIME MINISTER lie pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1646 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 1st August, 1991, and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that indigenously produced anti-cancer formulations are cheaper than imported one;

(b) what is the price at which indigenously produced anti-cancer formulations and imported formulations are being sold;

(c) what is the objective of concession/ exemption of custom duty on imported anti-cancer finished medicines which are Indigenously produced and how such a step would boost indigenous production;

(d) whether it is a fact that Vinblastine, Vincrestine, Danazol and Etoposide •re exempted from custom duty based on the recommendation of Government;

(e) if so, what steps are being taken to withdraw custom duty;

(f) whether it is also a fact that Etoposide is being produced in the country and is being sold at half price of imported vial;

(g) if so, the details thereof;

(h) whether it is a fact that indi-genous production attracts State Excise duty; and

(i) if so. what is the percentage of duty?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) There are a number of anti-cancer formulations sold in the country, of which only very few are being manufactured indigenously. In order to ensure the easy availability of these life saving drugs at cheaper prices, tffey are given customs duty exemption when imported. However, when domestic production of any fonnulation commences, .and request is received for withdrawal of this concession, the Department takes necessary action in this respect. No study has been done regardhn prevailing prices of these formulations which axe prices decontrolled.

(d) At present imported Vinabtaatioe Sulphate Injection, Etoposide Capsule/ Injection and Vincrestine Sulphate Infection are exempted from Customs Duty.

(e) As stated at 'a' to 'c' above, on receipt of request, further action will be taken.

(f) and (g) Production of Etoposide is being currently monitored in this Department.

(h) No Sir.

(i) Does not arise.

Inclusion of Drugs in DPCO

668. SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 755 given in the Rajya Sabha on 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) what are the names of drugs which were considered by the Standing Committee for wrong exclusion/inclusion from price control recommended by Kelkar Committee so far;

(b) what are the names of drugs which are still to be examined by the committee and by when decision on all drugs would be taken;

(c) whether Standing Committee has made any recommendation;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) what are the details of recommendations which have been accepted/rejected by Government; and

(f) how many recommendations are still pending and by when final decision would be taken?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) The Standing Committee

has considered all the bluk drugs on writes representations for wrong exclusion/inclusion clusion from price control under DPGO 1987 have been received by the Depart-itkatt of Chemical &. Petro-Chemicals.

(b) to (f) Hie whok matter is still under examination of Government.

Price of DeeadBStbeKa ete.

669. SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA: VTiB the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

&) whether it 's a fact that prices of Decadurabolin, Mixogen Injection and Testation Injection as charged by M/s. Enf&r contain around 300 per cent *MAPE;*

(b) if so, what is the MAPE provided In break up on Form 2-A submitted by the company under DPOQ, 1*87 of each

(c) whether it is also a fact that the company is looting public and siphon-big off the money to M/s. Martin & Harris;

(d) if so, what steps have been taken to order an enquiry under the Compa nies Act, 1956 of MRTP Act to investi gate the misfesence of funds;

(,e) is it also a fact that Government have received a number of representations from Members of Parliament, for wrong exclusion of their drugs from price control; and

(f) if so, date of receipt and action taken so far on each?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Government is not aware of any factual information in support of this allegation.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) and (f) The representations with regard to inclusion and exclusion of *drugs* price control are under CUB* ^deration of the Govtrnment

Set off allowed for special teas

670. SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred[1] Question 761 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th July 1991, and state:

(a) what were the amounts and item-on which set off was allowed in each: case by the Special Team;

(b) what were the amounts assessed by Special Team in Supreme Court case-after allowing set offs and what were the amounts assessed after review that hwe been determined;

(c) what are the main basis on which}. short assessment was made by the S)pe-cial Team;

(d) whether Government have a«y proposal to take action against the members of team; and

(e) if so, when and at what stage the action would be started?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN)- (a) and (c) The complaints of alleged acts of omission and commission received against the Special Team included, inter alia, the grant of unauthorised and inadmissible set-offs in the quantities of production and the sale value of various drugs and formulations.

(b) The information is given in the Statement.

(d) and (e) The question of taking action against the members of the Team would arise only after the liabilities of the companies are finally determined.